

workfolder serves not only to organize present created documents, but also as a guide to indicate which documents are expected to be created in the future.

Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection of claims 1-58 as anticipated by Nakagawa. "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Independent claim 1 expressly states "said contents element containing one or more placeholders for indicating documents expected to be added to said workfolder via said placeholder." Nakagawa is directed to a system for storing and managing documents in a hierarchical structure according to classifications. The reference fails to disclose or suggest that the workfolders contain a content element containing one or more placeholders for indicating documents expected to be added to the workfolder via the placeholder, as found in independent claim 1.

Independent claim 28 is similar to that of claim 1 in that it provides "said contents element containing a placeholder for indicating documents expected to be linked to said workfolder instance." As discussed above with respect to claim 1, Nakagawa fails to disclose or suggest that the workfolders contain a content element containing a placeholder and thus the reference does not disclose or suggest a placeholder for indicating documents expected to be linked to the workfolder, as found in independent claim 28.

Claim 37 is directed to a method for creating in a computer readable memory a structured workfolder for organizing electronic documents and includes the step of "creating at least one placeholder for indicating documents expected to be linked to said workfolder via said placeholder." As discussed above with respect to claim 1, Nakagawa fails to disclose or suggest that the workfolders contain a content element containing one or more placeholders and thus the reference does not disclose or suggest at least one placeholder for indicating documents expected to be linked to the workfolder via the placeholder, as found in independent claim 37.

Dependent claims 9-17 are further distinguishable over the prior art reference in that they further define the placeholder. As mentioned above with respect to independent claim 1, Nakagawa fails to disclose or suggest a

placeholder, much less, the further limitations on the placeholder as found in dependent claim 9-17.

Claim 18 further provides that the workfolder includes "a task data element containing one or more tasks which define a set of steps required to complete a unit of work, each said task having a name field indicating a particular task to be performed and a status field indicating the status of said task." The Examiner rejects claim 18 as taught by Nakagawa in col. 7, lines 18-56. Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection. Nakagawa fails to disclose or suggest a data element that defines a set of steps required to complete a unit of work, as found in claim 18. Dependent claims 29 and 51 also include limitations directed to a task data element and therefore are patentable over the prior art reference for the same reasons provided above with respect to claim 18.

For the foregoing reasons, applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 28 and 37 are patentable. Claims 2-27 depend from independent claim 1 and thus are patentable for the same reasons that independent claim 1 is patentable. Claims 29-36 depend from independent claim 38 and thus are patentable for the same reasons that independent claim 28 is patentable. Claims 38-58 depend from independent claim 37 and thus are patentable for the same reasons that independent claim 37 is patentable. Dependent claims 9-18, 29 and 51 are further distinguishable over the prior art reference for the additional reasons discussed above. Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

If the Examiner is of the opinion that modifications to the claims are necessary to place the application in condition for allowance, he is invited to contact Applicant's attorney at the number listed below for a telephone interview and Examiner's amendment.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 29,134

Nelson A. Blish/tmp
Rochester, NY 14650
Telephone: (716) 588-2720
Facsimile: (716) 477-4646